

Application No.: 10/823,930

Amendment dated: January 29, 2007

Reply to Office Action dated: September 29, 2006

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

To comply with the Examiner's request, the attached drawings include changes to Figure 1, removing element "12" from the figure. Figure 2 is amended removing element "a" from the figure. Figures 2 and 3a-b have been designated Prior Art.

Five (5) pages of replacement formal drawings are being submitted and replace any previous drawings submitted.

Attachment: Annotated Sheets Showing Changes
Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 17-20 were previously cancelled. The specification, the drawings, and claims 1-16 are objected to. Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 4-7, 9 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by applicant's admitted prior art Figures 2 and 3a and detailed description thereof (hereinafter "AAPA"). Claims 1, 4-7, 9 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wada et al., (hereinafter "Wada"), U.S. Patent No. 6,144,529. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ueno et al., (hereinafter "Ueno"), U.S. 2002/0126418. Claims 1, 4-9 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Koishi et al., (hereinafter "Koishi"), U.S. 2003/0002218. Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wada, U.S. Patent No. 6,144,529. Claims 1 and 9 are amended.

With regard to the objection to the title, Applicants submit the objection to the title is moot in light of the amendments to claims 1 and 9.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection, Applicants submit the amendment to claim 9 to correct an antecedent basis problem renders the rejection moot.

With regard to the objection to claims 1-16, status identifier are added to claims 1-16. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

With regard to the objection to the Drawings, the appropriate corrections are made to figures 1 and 2 by removing "12" in figure 1 and "α" in Figure 2, and to Figures 2, 3a and 3b by including a legend "Prior Art".

Applicants submit the cited references do not teach or suggest at least "[a] slider for high

Application No.: 10/823,930
Amendment dated: January 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated: September 29, 2006

density magnetic recording, comprising... a body with a width of 1.0mm or smaller and a length greater than 0.85mm, wherein the length to the width ratio is greater than 1.5..."(e.g., as described in claim 1).

For example, the length to width ratio of an embodiment cited in the AAPA is 1.25mm to 1.00mm, *i.e.*, 1.25. *See* Office Action dated 9/29/2006, paragraph 8.

Similarly, the length to width ratio of an embodiment cited in Wada is 1.25mm to 1.00mm, *i.e.*, 1.25. *See* Office Action dated 9/29/2006, paragraph 9.

Also, the length to width ratio of an embodiment cited in Ueno is 1.0mm to 0.7mm, *i.e.*, 1.43. *See* Office Action dated 9/29/2006, paragraph 10.

Finally, the length to width ratio of an embodiment cited in Koishi is 1.25mm to 1.00mm, *i.e.*, 1.25. *See* Office Action dated 9/29/2006, paragraph 11.

Applicants submit none of the cited references teach or describe at least “[a] slider for high density magnetic recording, comprising... a body with a length and a width, wherein the length to the width ratio is greater than 1.5..."(e.g., as described in claim 1).

Since each and every limitation of claim 1 is not taught by the cited references, Applicants submit the current §102 rejections are lacking, and claim 1 is allowable. Claim 9 contains similar allowable limitations, and therefore is allowable as well. Claims 2-8 and 10-16 are allowable for depending from allowable base claims.

Request for Allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 10/823,930

Amendment dated: January 29, 2007

Reply to Office Action dated: September 29, 2006


If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: January 29, 2007

By: 
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501



Application No: 2855/115
Amendment dated: January 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated: September 29, 2006
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

1/5




FIG.
Figure 1
(Prior Art)

2/5




FIG.
Figure 2
(Prior Art)

3/5




FIG. **Figure 3a**
(Prior Art)




FIG. **Figure 3b**
(Prior Art)




FIG. 4

5/5

Stiffness	Height (NM)	Pitch(uRAD)	Roll(uRAD)
Load(G)	103%	99%	15%
P-Torque(uN-M)	98%	102%	103%
R-Torque(uN-M)	108%	41%	50%

FIG. **Figure 5a**

Stiffness	Height (NM)	Pitch(uRAD)	Roll(uRAD)
Load(G)	97%	48%	155%
P-Torque(uN-M)	46%	36%	-126%
R-Torque(uN-M)	282%	-58%	70%

FIG. **Figure 5b**